DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 252 UD 019 810

AUTHOR	Offenberg, Robert M.; And Others
TITLE	Project PACT, Parent and Children Together; Evaluation of the First Year, 1977-1978.
INSTITUTION	Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	PSD-7911
PUB DATE	Oct 78
GRANT	G00770414
NOTE	21p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Adult Education Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Improvement Programs; Parent Education; *Parent Participation; *Parent Role; Parent School Relationship; Parent Student Relationship; *Program Effectiveness; *Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)

ABSTRACT

Project PACT was designed to complement a bilingual program at Potter-Thomas school by involving Hispanic parents in the education of their children. The emphasis was on improving the academic performance of Hispanic pupils by teaching their parents and other adults how to reinforce classroom instruction. At the end of the first year, there was evidence that parent participation in the summer program was associated with higher reading scores. The effect of parent participation on student behavior during the school-year program could not be determined because of external problems. However, more Hispanic adults than expected earned high school equivalency diplomas during the school-year program. In conclusion, the summer program appears to have worked well as designed and was associated with superior pupil behavior. The school-year program had some successes, but needed modifications. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SEP 1 3 1979

ED177252

PROJECT PACT
Parent and Children Together

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST YEAR
1977-1978

Report
7911

Prepared by

Robert M. Offenberg
Research Associate

Carlos Rodriguez-Acosta
Research Intern

Bob Epstein
Research Assistant

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
Federal Evaluation Resource Services

October, 1978

UD019810

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. H. Kean
Philadelphia School District, Office of Res. & Eval
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JUL 1979
RECEIVED

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Michael P. Marcase

Deputy Superintendent
Mr. Charles Highsmith

INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

Dr. Bernard G. Kelner
Associate Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction

Dr. Eleanor Sandstrom
Director of Foreign Language Education

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Mr. Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President
Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. Augustus Baxter
Mrs. Lawrence Boonin
Mr. Samuel H. Rubin
Robert M. Sebastian, Esq.
Mrs. Michael Stack
George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.
Dr. Nicholas Trolio

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Dr. Michael H. Kean
Executive Director, Research and Evaluation

Dr. Stephen H. Davidoff
Assistant Director, Federal Evaluation Resource Services

This program was funded in part by the United States Office of Education, ESEA Title VII Grant Number G00-77-0414.

ABSTRACT

Project PACT (Parents and Children Together) was designed to complement the existing Let's Be Amigos-Model A bilingual program at Potter-Thomas School by involving Hispanic parents in the education of their children. During the summer, parents prepared curriculum packets under the supervision of curriculum developers and observed instruction of children. During the school year, English, Spanish and GED high-school equivalency courses were provided for adults and new curriculum packets were planned by developers.

At the end of the first program year, there was evidence that parents' participation in the summer program was associated with higher reading scores and improved attendance among their children during the school term. The questionnaire developed by project administration and evaluators to assess parents' knowledge about the Potter-Thomas school program was too easy, and therefore unable to detect change in the parents themselves.

The school-year program was affected by external events, and was characterized by problem-solving steps. Evaluators were impressed with the flexibility of program management's response to school and community realities. A strike of maintenance personnel delayed the beginning of the school-year program. This made it unlikely that parent partcipation would affect the school behavior of children, and evaluators did not find an effect.

Courses (in English and in Spanish) leading to high school equivalency diplomas and an English language course were well received by the community, but a Spanish language course attracted few participants and was eventually discontinued. Twenty-two Hispanic adults attempted the equivalency examinations, and nine received high-school diplomas--a better outcome than expected for the first program year.

The number of parent workshops conducted was less than the number planned. Initially, few parents attended the workshops and the school-year curriculum development component activities. Program management took steps which improved the amount of parent participation.

In conclusion, the summer program appears to have worked well as designed and was associated with superior pupil behavior. The school-year program had some successes, but needed modifications. Program management reacted to the need appropriately and effectively.

CONTENTS

Abstract *iii*

Rationale *1*

Expected Outcomes *1*

Implementation *1*

Attainment of Objectives *5*

Discussion *14*

Conclusion *14*

Tables *16*

Project PACT (Parents and Children Together) was designed to complement the existing Let's Be Amigos-Model A bilingual program at the Potter-Thomas School. The major activities of the program are: Teaching parents about school operation and curriculum and teaching basic skills to adults of the school-community. As a result of these activites, pupil performance in the school should be enhanced.

RATIONALE

In the community served by Potter-Thomas School, many adults who are in-migrants from Puerto Rico are unable to reinforce school learning at home. Many of these adults lack basic academic skills, are unaware of the resources in the community and the city, and are unfamiliar with the school's program. In order to help these parents become resources for reinforcement of their children's learning, academic, cultural, practical and school curriculum content is to be imparted. The parents, in turn, will help their children be more successful in school.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The primary goal of the project is to improve academic performance of Hispanic pupils by teaching parents and other adults how to reinforce classroom instruction. In the course of pursuing this goal, parents are expected to become more knowledgeable about the school and about ways they can assist their children at home. The parents are also expected to develop their own academic competence, become wiser consumers, and become more knowledgable about cultural resources in the City of Philadelphia. Teachers are expected to design a wide variety of learning packets for parents to make and then use with their children.

IMPLEMENTATION

In 1977-78 the project operation was, in most respects, in accord with the proposal. As is the case with most projects in their first year, it was necessary to alter some program aspects. Due to a strike of custodial help during the fall, implementation of the school year program was delayed.

To inform parents of pupils in the Potter-Thomas community about the summer program, a notice was sent home with pupils shortly before the end of school, articles appeared in a Hispanic newspaper, and announcements were made on the Spanish-language radio station. These were supplemented by door-to-door canvassing by project personnel. As a result of these efforts, 67 parents (92% of the target) participated in the summer program. These parents were divided into three groups. Each group met with a team of two curriculum developers. During the second, third, and fourth weeks of the five week program, the groups of parents met with two other teams of curriculum developers. Each of the three curriculum-developer teams specialized in a two-year level span: pre-kindergarten and kindergarten, first and second grades, third and fourth grades. As a result

of rotation of parent groups among curriculum-developer teams, parents who atttended the entire program had experience with curricula for all grade levels in the Potter-Thomas School.

When the parents were present, they were paid a stipend of two dollars per hour. On the average day 54 parents were present. On most days the parents worked on curriculum materials planned by one team of curriculum developers. The result of these efforts was instructional packets consisting of a game, chart, or other instructional aid to be used at home. Examples of packets made by parents are: board games to teach arithmetic facts, Spanish phonics, and word recognition; a picture book to be used to help children form concepts of size, color, activity, and number; a "multiplication train;" a chart to teach fractions; and a game which requires a child to figure out the number of syllables in Spanish words. Daily monitoring by a member of the evaluation team suggested that, in the course of making these packets, parents were given instruction in the concepts they embodied. This was necessary because some of the parents were mastering the concepts for the first time while creating the packets.

After the first week of the summer program, parents began to observe instruction of the children. The children's instruction was organized in three levels, pre-kindergarten and kindergarten, first and second grades, and third and fourth grades. Seven resource specialists, all qualified teachers who are fluent in both Spanish and English, worked with the pupils. The instruction was planned to include one hour of language arts, one hour of mathematics, and one-half hour of social studies. Observations by evaluators suggest that more time was spent on language arts than the amount planned. Instruction appeared to be less formal than work conducted during school-year classes, with greater emphasis on learning through songs and games. The average number of pupils present on a given day was 120. The highest attendance of children (141) was on a day in which half the pupils were on a trip to the zoo. The poorest attendance was 91 pupils.

During the summer program, six different cultural and educational sites were visited. Parents and children visited the Philadelphia Zoo (two trips, each accomodating one half the program participants) and the Franklin Institute science museum. Parents visited the main branch and the Ramonita de Rodriquez branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and the historical area which includes Independence Hall. On the trips, the resource specialists and curriculum developers provided orientation to the children and parents. On two of the trips--to the historical area and to the art museum--guides conducted tours. The evaluators were impressed with the parents' enthusiasm about the trips.

Overall, monitoring during the summer showed that the program implemented was virtually the same as the program described in the proposal. Evaluators'

observations indicated that it was well received by both parents and pupils who participated. In implementing the program it became evident that personal contact (home visits by staff, participants inviting other parents) was an important element in the initial recruitment of parents and children.

The school-year program began later than planned due to a strike of maintenance personnel. This strike delayed the organization of activities other than pupil instruction until December. Major recruiting activities began in late December and continued through early January, with courses beginning in the latter month. Participants were recruited through announcements on the Spanish-language radio station and in a Spanish-language newspaper, a letter sent home with pupils, and canvassing by the school's community coordinators.

One hundred and two people were recruited through these steps and through information passed on to them by people in the community. Of these, 75 people attended the school-year program enough times for background information to be obtained. Thirty-two of these reported having children who attended Potter-Thomas School.

The courses that were offered were Spanish, English, GED in Spanish, and GED in English. The GED courses, which lead to a high school diploma, were offered in afternoon and evening sessions. Initially each course met twice weekly. After the principal reported that some participants wanted a third meeting, the project director arranged for an additional weekly session of English instruction. The courses were taught in English or in Spanish by a bilingual resource specialist for adult basic education, who was a native speaker of the target language. One served as the resource specialist for all course offerings in English. Two resource specialists divided the responsibility for instruction in Spanish.

Another aspect of the school-year activities was conducted by curriculum developers and began in December. With the exception of one curriculum developer, who was replaced because she became a principal, the personnel was the same as that filling developer roles during the previous summer. This aspect consisted of two, two-hour sessions per week. Initially, the first half of one of the sessions was devoted to answering parents' questions about the school work of their children. Curriculum developers devoted the remaining time to planning new learning packets.

During the winter and spring, the format of these activities and the role of the curriculum developers evolved. During the first few weeks, very few parents made use of the services of the developers--for example, only four parents were present on one occasion when evaluators visited. After a few weeks an invitation was extended to all Hispanic parents to join with the curriculum developers for a social gathering, at which the project director spoke. After this

occasion, evaluators observed that the number of parents who participated increased to about thirty (no regular record of parents' attendance was kept).

In early spring the curriculum developers' schedules were changed because parents wanted more opportunities to discuss the school work of their children. With the agreement of the program coordinator, the curriculum developers held discussions with parents one hour and worked on learning packets for one hour of each session. At each, one of the curriculum developers would supervise participants' children by leading them in games and helping with homework. Another developer helped a group of parents improve their reading and writing in Spanish.

According to the program coordinator, curriculum packets developed during the winter were not finalized and were not disseminated. At the end of the year covered by this evaluation, revision and editing were underway.

Parent workshops dealing with family relations, domestic arts, and similar subjects did not meet with success until the time and day were adjusted. The first two workshops (on family relations and child psychology) were held on Saturday mornings. They were poorly attended--two parents were present at the workshop observed by evaluators. The two remaining workshops were held during afternoon school hours, when adult education classes were being conducted. Participants in these classes and other interested parents were then able to attend these workshops. The site coordinator estimated that 25 people were present for these programs.

During the school year three trips were organized. Participants in the GED, Spanish, and English instruction and parents who attended sessions with curriculum developers visited Longwood Gardens botanical park, the University of Pennsylvania Anthropological Museum, and Washington, D.C. The trips were free.

Review of project implementation suggested to the evaluators that project management attempted to conform to the design specified in the proposal. Differences observed by evaluators appeared to be due to the newness of the program. In the opinion of the project evaluators, modifications made during the course of the program were reasonable responses to situations found in the school community. Two points may require special attention during the coming year. Many adults in the school-year GED and language courses, though of the local community, do not have children at Potter-Thomas Bilingual School. Perhaps some modification of the ways in which participants for this component are recruited is warranted in order to increase the number of parents of Potter-Thomas School pupils. Second, review and dissemination of learning packets developed during the school year needs to be completed.

ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES

Objective 1: To increase parents' information about bilingual programs. By the end of the school year 1977-78 more parents will know that bilingual education includes instruction in mathematics, science and social studies in two languages, English and Spanish; that it includes reading, writing and speaking instruction in the two languages; and that it includes the study of the history and culture of Puerto Rico.

By the end of the summer program, there was a trend toward parents having more information, but due to high pretest scores it is unclear whether the program had any effect on the parents' knowledge about the specific topics listed in the objective.

During the brief period between the grant award and the implementation of the summer component, a true-false questionnaire was developed by the project director and program evaluators. The questionnaire consisted of 14 items. When pretested, summer program participants who took both pre- and posttests averaged 11.6 (83%) correct. When the high prescores were discovered, a correction for guessing was computed to increase the sensitivity of the subsequent analysis. With this correction, 21 parents' posttest scores were higher, seventeen were lower, and five remained the same. A Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was computed to see if any statistically significant change occurred. The results showed that the observed increase in score was not indicative of a statistically significant improvement.

The average score of parents who took only one of the two tests was within one item of the averages of parents who completed the questionnaire on both occasions. When incorrect and omitted responses to each question were examined, four questions were not answered correctly by 30% or more of the parents on either the pretest or posttest. With the exception of one question, for which the number of incorrect responses increased, there was little change in any of these items.

Three of the four difficult questions dealt with the relationship between Spanish and English instruction at the school: whether the pupils must learn English before learning mathematics, how much of the day is allotted to instruction using Spanish, and how much classroom contact Hispanic pupils have with English-speaking pupils. The fourth question dealt with pupils' options for continuing bilingual education after leaving the Potter-Thomas School. Responses to other questions showed that the parents had clear ideas about the bilinguality of the faculty, the bicultural and bilingual nature of the coursework, testing, school communication with the home, and parents' rights to discuss progress of their children.

Review of the properties of the questionnaire led the evaluators to conclude that is was unlikely to detect the effect of the winter program on parents. Therefore, a new instrument was developed for use in 1978-79.

Objective 1: To improve the achievement of the pupils whose parents participated in the summer and school year program on the Test de destrezas basicas en lectura, Prueba de lectura de Puerto Rico and California Achievement Test to statistically significant degree when grade, age, length of residence in an English speaking environment and years of attendance in a bilingual program are taken into account.

Shortly after the school year program began, this objective was revised at the request of the principal of Potter-Thomas School. After discussion with the evaluators, the project director approved the revision. In the modified form, the objective was attained for children of participants in the summer component, but appears to have not been attained by children of participants in only the school year program language classes, GED classes, and curriculum development.

The revised objective had two distinct parts: (a) Children of participants in the program would score statistically significantly higher than others on Test de destrezas basicas en lectura, a test of Spanish reading skills. (b) Children of participants would have better attendance records in 1977-78 than in the preceeding year.

To evaluate the effect of the program on Spanish reading, teachers administered the Test de destrezas basicas en lectura to Hispanic pupils attending the Potter-Thomas School in April. Upon the advice of the school administration, each teacher of Spanish as a First Language administered the test to all children in Grades 1-4 who were studying the subject. Teachers were not aware that children of PACT participants would be differentiated from others for this evaluation.

When administrative personnel and evaluators monitored the testing, they discovered that some teachers departed from the test maker's directions by providing inappropriate coaching. This resulted in very high scores for many pupils.

When faced with this problem, evaluators developed a method of analysis which would provide valid information about Project PACT despite the test administration problem. The analysis is shown in Table 1. Spanish first language classes in the school were organized by grade and ability. Teachers tested the classes they taught. Evaluators reasoned that, grade, initial ability, and test administration irregularities would all be controlled statistically by controlling for the pupil's class.

Linear regression was used to carry out the analysis. One class, number 13, was arbitrarily selected as the standard of comparison to be used in controlling for the class effects because it was the largest. In Table 1, the values in the column "Unstandardized B" reflect, for each of the other classes, the average number of points that pupils scored above class 13 when parent participation is controlled. The right hand column shows the probability that each unstandardized B was greater than zero or statistically significantly above the comparison class. While all but two classes were significantly above class 13, this is only of passing interest because the evaluators' aim was to eliminate the effect of variables associated with class, not to examine them.

The last two lines of Table 1 reflect the impact of Project PACT with class differences controlled. The unstandardized B for the variable "parent in summer program" is 8.3, and is highly significant. This means that when parents participated in the summer program their children's score averaged more than 8 points above the score of their classmates. Similarly, examination of the line "parent in school-year program" shows that there was a trend for these pupils to score below their classmates, but this trend was not strong enough to meet commonly used criteria for statistical significance; i.e., it may be chance.

Part (b) of the revised objective described improvement in pupils' attendance brought about by parent participation in PACT. This part of the objective was attained, with the summer program the primary factor in its attainment.

Forty-seven pupils (who were enrolled in a public school in 1976-1977, had parents who participated in Project PACT, and attended Potter-Thomas School in 1977-1978) were included in the analysis of attendance. Table 2 shows the number whose parents participated in the summer program, the winter program or both, and associated changes in attendance. Attendance was computed by dividing the number of days a pupil was present by the number of days on roll. Attendance "improved" if the fraction computed for 1977-78 was larger than the fraction for 1976-77. If the 1977-78 fraction was smaller, attendance "worsened".

Examination of the bottom row of Table 2 shows that 77% of the pupils improved, 19% worsened and 4% remained the same. A sign-test computed on these data yielded a z of 3.50, showing that the concentration of pupils in the "improved" category would be found by chance less than one time in a thousand.

Examination of the data of pupils whose parents participated in the summer program (The lines marked "summer only" and "both" on Table 2) show that

participation in the summer program was related to improvement. In contrast, although the number of cases is small, participation by parents in only the school year program seems to have had no effect--there is no way that seven pupils could be more evenly divided between "improved" and "worsened."

At this point, there is evidence that the summer program of PACT produced changes in pupil behavior. The same cannot be said for the school-year program. However, evaluators would be remiss in not pointing out that the reason for findings associated with the school year program may be due to premature and incomplete evaluation. First, parents' participation in the school-year program took place during the last half of the year. The effect of their participation may not yet have been observable among their children. Second, because testing required that pupils be in Grades 1-4 and because assessment of attendance required that pupils attend a public school in 1976-77 and Potter-Thomas School in 1977-78, the number of pupils available for evaluating the impact of the school year program was small. Long term follow-up of pupils may be required for these reasons before a fair evaluation of the school year program is possible.

Self-selection is involved in Project PACT, a factor with which this evaluation has not dealt. Lastly, analysis of attendance improvement assumed that attendance was unrelated to pupil grade. There is evidence that there is a relationship.

Objective 3: To provide six workshops during the school year dealing with the history and culture of Puerto Rico in order to develop pride of parents and pupils in their origin.

The objective is considered attained. One workshop for parents was conducted, and six additional events were held.

The workshop focused on history and culture of Puerto Rico. It was conducted in Spanish by a Hispanic supervisor of the school district. The project coordinator reported that 25 people attended. The program was held at the same time as adult education classes of the school-year program. Participants were both parents of pupils of the Potter-Thomas School and non-parents enrolled in the adult education classes.

Project management indicated that in addition to the formal workshop, Project PACT participants were invited to attend in the following events: Puerto Rican Week Festival, a Fiesta Foclorica in celebration of the discovery of Puerto Rico, the school's bicultural Christmas celebration, both Black History Week and Pan-American Week, and a program that honored the project director and acknowledged parents who had decided to take GED high school-equivalency examinations (See Objective 6). During four programs, foods of Puerto Rico were served. During most programs, songs and dances were performed.

Of these events, the last, honoring the project director and parents who were to take the GED, was monitored by program evaluators. It was attended by 124 adults, most of whom were either participants in Project PACT, their friends, or their spouses. This program included a presentation by the staff of the Office of Measurement and Research of Temple University (who described the GED examination) and an assistant and associate superintendent of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction.

Although only one formal workshop on Puerto Rican history and culture was conducted, in the evaluators' opinion, the other events were able to contribute to the pride of participants in their ethnic origin.

Objective 4: To enable parents to interact with teachers through: a) observation of teachers in the classroom--daily in summer program, two to three times during the school year, b) creation of learning packets with help of resource specialists, to be used at home with children. These packets will include a variety of activities to reinforce learning, such as individual vocabulary files, force learning, such as individual vocabulary files, picture cards, mathematical games, mnemonic devices.

This objective describes several independent subobjectives. With one exception, all were attained, albeit with some modification.

Evaluators' records show that parents had the opportunity to observe classes during the summer program once program organization was completed. The frequency of the observation was not as high as specified in the proposal. Parent groups observed the instruction of children two times per week, not five as specified in the objective. As evaluators understand the situation, it was a question of the relative emphasis to be given to creation of learning packets and to observation. During the summer program, staff and supervisory personnel agreed that two substantial observation periods (of about one hour) followed by discussion of the observation with the curriculum developers was a better format than shorter daily observations. Although this format departs from the objective as stated, it appears that the underlying goal, to have parents observe and discuss the processes of bilingual education, was attained.

This objective also called for two or three school-year meetings of parents for observation of teaching at the school. No meetings for this purpose were held under the auspices of Project PACT, although many parents are known to have had contacts with teachers on other occasions.

Part b of Objective 4 was attained. A description of learning packets prepared during the summer program can be found in the implementation section. Evaluators' observations indicated that all parents who attended regularly during the summer program completed packets and took them home for use with their children.

The intended outcome of instructional packet development during the school year program was quite different. During the school-year, parents did not make packets--teachers planned them. The packets were not made by, or distributed to, parents. Evaluators understand that when final versions of the packets become available, they will be reproduced by project staff or by parents, so they can be taken home and be used with children. No final products of the school year packet development were available to parents before the evaluation year ended.

Objective 5: To provide courses twice during the school year, in order to teach communication skills in English and Spanish. At least 15 parents will be enrolled in each course.

This objective is considered attained for the English communications skills class, but not for the Spanish class. Each course was offered once because of the late implementation of the school year program. As a result of enthusiastic response to the English class, the amount of instruction in this subject was increased. As a result of the low enrollment in the Spanish class, it was terminated before the end of the school year.

A total of 28 adults enrolled in the English class. Judging from their names, all were of Hispanic origin. Evaluators were able to establish that at least 10 of these were parents who had one or more children attending Potter-Thomas School. Four more parents reported having children attending other schools, and two parents did not provide information about schools. The remaining participants did not report that they had children or did not complete the parent information form.

The average attendance of the English communication skills class was 12.9 people per session. At first the class met two times per week. This was increased to three times per week at the request of participants.

In contrast to the response to English instruction, few parents expressed interest in the Spanish language arts class. Six adults enrolled--four were parents of Potter-Thomas School pupils. Judging from their names, all were Hispanic. Program records showed that all six were enrolled in the GED classes. The average attendance was 3.6 parents per class. In late May, the Spanish language arts class was discontinued.

Objective 6: To provide courses in basic education in English and Spanish leading to the GED diploma in English or Spanish. At least 15 parents will be enrolled in each course.

The objective is considered attained. Two GED courses in Spanish and two GED courses in English were conducted. More than 15 adults enrolled in each course, however many were not parents of Potter-Thomas School pupils. The

report from Temple University's Measurement and Research Center indicated that at least 22 participants took a part of the GED test battery, and nine received high school equivalency diplomas.

Twenty-seven people enrolled in the day session of the Spanish GED course. On average, 8.85 were present. This number reflects both attrition and late enrollment. The first group of 18 adults began to attend in late January. In January and February, attendance ranged between 12 and 19. During the spring, the number attending declined, thereby lowering the overall average.

A similar pattern was found among the 31 participants who enrolled in the afternoon GED course in English. The average attendance was 8.45. During the first 12 sessions, attendance ranged from 10 to 15. During the spring the number declined.

Data was not as complete for the evening Spanish GED course as it was for the day courses. The resource specialist who taught in Spanish listed 35 participants of the PACT program on his roll. In addition nine people preparing for the GED at a high school attended the evening Spanish PACT classes according to the resource specialist. This specialist did not keep a daily record of attendnce because he felt that it was inappropriate to call role in a class consisting of adults. Monitoring by program evaluators suggested that typical attendance was about 15 people.

The evening English GED class records were complete. A total of 41 adults were enrolled. As was the case with the daytime classes, the record shows that throughout the period there was attrition and late enrollment. The average attendance was 8.91 per class. Unlike the daytime program, the attendance remained fairly constant--at least seven pupils were present for 80% of the class meetings.

As some participants transferred from one class to another, the reported enrollments in the GED classes reflect double counting. When duplicates are taken into account, records of resource specialists show that 128 people participated in the four GED classes.

The resource specialist of the evening Spanish GED class arranged for virtually all of his students to take the Spanish version of the GED high school equivalency test at Temple University's Measurement and Research Center. During the year-end meeting described under Objective 3, a representative of the center showed the program participants how to apply for the examination and gave advice about final preparation for it. As a result, 22 participants paid a fifteen-dollar entrance fee and attempted at least one part of the examination. Nine passed the entire test and were awarded high school equivalency diplomas.

The examination consisted of five subtests. Everyone who took the examination passed at least one. As not all of the participants attempted all subtests, conclusions about preparation in the various subject areas are tentative. The part for which participants seemed best prepared was mathematics--no one who attempted it failed. Social Studies appeared to be the most difficult subtest, with seven failures out of 19 attempts. As reading was the next most difficult part, evaluators believe that reading problems may underlie the failures on the Social Studies subtest.

The pattern of passing and failing scores suggests to the evaluators that the reading of social studies material should be emphasized in the second program year. The high turnout for the examination and the reasonable number of participants who earned diplomas suggest that project management should conduct activities which encourage participants to try the examination.

Objective 7: To help parents cope with their new environment and become wiser consumers through bi-monthly workshops during the school year(dealing with family relations, domestic arts, nutrition, consumer education, drug addiction) and through visits to community agencies.

This objective was partially attained. Because of late implementation of the school-year program, only three workshops were held. The first two were held on Saturday morning, but low attendance resulted in rescheduling the third to a week-day afternoon.

When the school year program was organized five workshops, to be conducted in Spanish, were scheduled for Saturday mornings. They were on Health and Mental Health, Family Relations, Drug Abuse, Consumer Education, and Nutrition.

The first two were conducted on Saturday morning. Parents were informed about them through notices distributed to children in school. The notices were in Spanish and English. Attendance was reported to be very low during the first. The second was monitored by evaluators. At this workshop there were two parents and three program supervisory staff present. Both the parents and the supervisors appeared to be interested in the workshop, which was conducted in Spanish in a seminar format.

Before the third, project management concluded that Saturday morning was a poor time for workshops, and rescheduled one for a weekday afternoon. Notices were distributed to children and adult education class participants were invited. The program coordinator reported that 25 people attended this last program. As a result of the change in time and day, the last two scheduled workshops could not be held.

Objective 8: To take parents and their children on various field trips to cultural and historic sites such as Independent Hall, Museum of Art, Franklin Institute, Zoological Gardens, and the Free Library during the summer and during the school year.

This objective was attained. As discussed in the implementation section, six different trips were conducted during the summer program, three during the school year.

The first trip, to the Independence Hall historical area was attended by 59 parents, who took School District buses from the Potter-Thomas School building to the histor cal area. Children remained at the school, and the trip was geared solely to the interests of the adults.

The second trip was to the zoo. Project management expected to conduct one trip, but due to the large turnout the buses available could not accomodate everyone. As a result, about half the parents and children visited the zoo on each of two trips. Records do not indicate how many people went on the trip each time, but the highest total attendance of children in the summer program was on the day of the first trip to the zoo, and the second highest attendance of parents was on the day of the other.

Fifty-six parents visited the Philadelphia Museum of Art in late July. A tour-guide assisted the parents, while curriculum developers provided Spanish translation help. Parents and children visited the Franklin Institute together. One hundred and twenty-two children and sixty-two parents were accompanied by the curriculum developers and resource specialists of the summer program. These personnel provided information in Spanish about the science exhibits for the parents and children as the need arose.

Two trips to the Free Library of Philadelphia were made by parents. First, 57 parents visited the main branch of the library. This was followed by a trip to the neighborhood Romonita de Rodriquez branch by 59 parents. The neighborhood branch is named in memory of a supervisor of bilingual education in the Philadelphia schools, and contains a collection of Spanish books. As the branch library is near Potter-Thomas, parents walked and learned the route. Discussion with parents revealed that some applied for library cards and took out books.

During the school-year program three trips were conducted in the late spring. All were for parents and participants in the language arts and GED classes. No record of attendance was kept for the first trip--to Longwood Botanical Gardens. On the second trip, to the University of Pennsylvania Anthropology Museum, 14 adults were accompanied by curriculum developers and resource specialists.

The last trip of the school year program was a one-day bus-tour to Washington D.C. In addition to resource specialists, 76 parents, GED and language class participants visited government buildings, national monuments and the Aeronautics and Space Museum of the Smithsonian Insititution. On this trip, meals were provided through project resources.

DISCUSSION

The summer program carried out was similar to the one described by the proposal. The impact on parents and pupils was consistent with the aims of the program. The number of Hispanic parents who participated was close to the estimate made by project management in the proposal, and the activities of the program were carried out in a manner which differed from the proposal in only minor ways. Although change in parents over the summer was not measured by the questionnaire (because it was too easy), their children's school-year behavior suggested that the summer program was effective.

The impact of the school-year program is clear in one respect: Hispanic adults of the local community earned GED high-school equivalency diplomas. Its impact on children of the Potter-Thomas School is not clear for three reasons. The first problem preventing clear evaluation of the effect on pupils was late implementation. As the major elements in the school-year program were not begun until January, any changes they brought about in parents may not have had time to affect children in ways measured by this evaluation. For this reason, evaluation of the second program year should try, in part, to focus on children whose parents participated during the first.

There was also difficulty in defining the groups of adults who are school-year program "participants." The proposal implies that adults are parents of pupils of Potter-Thomas School. This was not always true; many were members of the school community, but did not have children enrolled in the school. While this is of value to the community at large, more Potter-Thomas pupils would have received direct benefits if more school-year program participants were parents. From the program evaluation viewpoint, a small number of parents decreases the probability that evaluators will be able to determine the effects of the school-year program.

Evaluators need guidance in determining how some children of school-year program participants should be considered. In the evaluations of pupil behavior (Objective 2), to be a child of a school-year program participant a parent had to enroll in a GED or language course. If parents attended only lectures or workshops, their children were not considered part of the school-year program pupil group. Program management needs to clarify whether these children should be included in subsequent evaluations, and if so, how.

CONCLUSION

Project PACT had successes during the first year of operation, most notably, change in pupil behavior through activities involving parents and achievement in adult education. Concerns voiced in the previous sections reflect implementation problems which, in the evaluators' experience, are faced by all projects when ideas on paper are brought to life for the first time. Mid-program modifications,

such as increasing the time of one activity, dropping a second, and changing the day and time of a third, reflect sensitivity to real world constraints. Evaluators expect that attainment of the goal of improving pupil performance through education of parents was begun and will be accomplished.

TABLE 1

LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF SPANISH READING TEST SCORES

Control Variables	Unstandardized B	p<
Class 1	47.8	.0001
Class 2	41.8	.0001
Class 3	33.6	.0001
Class 4	50.1	.0001
Class 5	36.4	.0001
Class 6	43.2	.0001
Class 7	27.9	.0032
Class 8	12.2	.2866
Class 9	46.2	.0001
Class 10	3.3	.5436
Class 11	27.4	.0001
Class 12	51.2	.0001
Class 13	----	-----
Class 14	12.3	.0019
Class 15	35.7	.0001
Class 16	16.7	.0001
Class 17	25.6	.0001
Program Variables		
Parent in Summer Program	8.3	.0011
Parent in School-year Program	-5.0	.1383

R-Square=0.57 N=307

Standard deviation of scores about the hyperplane=15.5

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF PUPILS WHOSE PARENTS WERE IN PROJECT PACT WHOSE ATTENDANCE IMPROVED, WORSENED AND REMAINED THE SAME.

Program(s)	Change In Attendance						Total	
	Improved		Worsened		Same			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Summer Only	27	82	4	12	2	6	33	100
School-year Only	4	57	3	43	0	0	7	100
Both Programs	5	71	2	29	0	0	7	100
Total	36	77	9	19	2	4	47	100